



Rochester Hills

Minutes

City Council Regular Meeting

1000 Rochester Hills Dr
Rochester Hills, MI 48309
(248) 656-4600
Home Page:
www.rochesterhills.org

David J. Blair, Jason Carlock, Ryan Deel, Carol Morlan, Theresa Mungoli, Marvie Neubauer and David Walker

Vision Statement: *The Community of Choice for Families and Business*

Mission Statement: *"Our mission is to sustain the City of Rochester Hills as the premier community of choice to live, work and raise a family by enhancing our vibrant residential character complemented by an attractive business community."*

Monday, June 10, 2024

7:00 PM

1000 Rochester Hills Drive

CALL TO ORDER

President Deel called the Regular Rochester Hills City Council Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Michigan Time.

ROLL CALL

Present 7 - David Blair, Jason Carlock, Ryan Deel, Carol Morlan, Theresa Mungoli, Marvie Neubauer and David Walker

Others Present:

*Bryan Barnett, Mayor
Dan Christ, City Attorney
Bill Fritz, Public Services Director
Todd Gary, Deputy Fire Chief
Tim Hollis, Deputy Building Director
Chris McLeod, Planning Manager
Sara Roediger, Director of Planning and Economic Development
Leanne Scott, City Clerk
Joe Snyder, Chief Financial Officer*

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Blair, seconded by Morlan, that the Agenda be Approved as Presented. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Blair, Carlock, Deel, Morlan, Mungoli, Neubauer and Walker

COUNCIL AND YOUTH COMMITTEE REPORTS

Rochester Hills Government Youth Council (RHGYC):

President Deel introduced RHGYC Representative, Siddh Sheth.

Mr. Sheth shared that he is in the eleventh grade at Stoney Creek High School and this is his third year on the Youth Council. He reported that they have received 25 applications from students wanting to serve on the RHGYC for the upcoming year, and noted that interviews are scheduled for the end of this week. He stated that the RHGYC is in the process of planning its end-of-year celebration, which will include a farewell to the graduating senior members.

President Deel announced that he had the opportunity to watch Mr. Sheth and the Stoney Creek Marching Band perform at Jimmy John's Field last Friday evening and complimented them on their performance.

ORDINANCE FOR INTRODUCTION

2024-0273 Request for Acceptance for First Reading - Ordinance Amendments to Amend Sections 138-5.100 and 138-5.101 of Chapter 138, Zoning, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, to add conditions as to when reduced residential side yard setbacks are permitted and establish a maximum building height on existing lots of less than 60 feet in width; and would allow the Planning Commission to consider a reduction in the required rear yard setback for nonresidential properties in the Highway Business District when the property adjoins another nonresidential district, and to ensure consistency across various ordinance sections; to repeal conflicting or inconsistent ordinances, and prescribe a penalty for violations

Attachments: [062424 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Ordinance \(Revised\).pdf](#)
[061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Ordinance 052124.pdf](#)
[Memo McLeod 052124.pdf](#)
[Memo McLeod 041024.pdf](#)
[Minutes PC 052124 \(Draft\).pdf](#)
[Minutes PC 0416245 \(Draft\).pdf](#)
[Public Hearing Notice.pdf](#)
[061024 Resolution.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

Chris McLeod, Planning Manager, stated that the first amendment addresses side yard setbacks in lots less than 60 feet wide. He explained that in order to prevent houses from being built too close together, the proposed amendment would require that reduced side yards not be adjacent to one another, ensuring a minimum distance between buildings. He noted that the amendment also aims to limit the height of structures on these smaller lots to 24 feet to the mid-span of the roof, maintaining scale with existing smaller, single-story homes in those areas.

He noted the second amendment pertains to the Highway Business (HB) district. He shared that the HB district was unintentionally omitted from the previous year's non-residential district cleanup, which allowed the Planning Commission to modify rear yard setbacks when adjacent to other commercial districts. He explained that this amendment would rectify this and enable the Planning Commission to adjust

rear yard setbacks without requiring a hardship demonstration or Zoning Board of Appeals review. He noted this will provide more usable area for HB district properties.

Ms. Mungoli thanked Mr. McLeod and the Planning Commission for bringing this amendment before Council.

Vice President Walker inquired whether any current or pending projects would violate this new ordinance.

Mr. McLeod clarified that the small lot provision primarily affects individual single-family homes, and while there might be some plans under review, no specific violations were known. Regarding the Highway Business (HB) district amendment, he stated that a gas station revitalization project at Crooks and M-59 was currently pending and awaiting the amendment's approval to allow for a potential reduction in the rear yard setback. He noted that this project was, in fact, the catalyst for identifying the omission in the previous ordinance, prompting the city to expedite the amendment to facilitate the gas station's redevelopment.

A motion was made by Mungoli, seconded by Neubauer, that this matter be Accepted for First Reading by Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Blair, Carlock, Deel, Morlan, Mungoli, Neubauer and Walker

Enactment No: RES0190-2024

Resolved, that an Ordinance to Amend Sections 138-5.100 and 138-5.101 of Chapter 138, Zoning, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, to add conditions as to when reduced residential side yard setbacks are permitted and establish a maximum building height on existing lots of less than 60 feet in width; and would allow the Planning Commission to consider a reduction in the required rear yard setback for nonresidential properties in the Highway Business District when the property adjoins another nonresidential district, and to ensure consistency across various ordinance sections; to repeal conflicting or inconsistent ordinances, and prescribe a penalty for violations is hereby Accepted for First Reading.

2024-0291

Request to Amend the Ordinance for First Reading - Section 134-9 of Article III of Chapter 134 - Signs, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, to change temporary signage on construction fence screening from being allowed only in the Brooklands District to being allowed citywide

Attachments: [062424 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Ordinance \(Revised\).pdf](#)
[061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Ordinance.pdf](#)
[061024 Resolution.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

Chris McLeod, Planning Manager, and **Sara Roediger**, Planning & Economic Development Director, were present.

Mr. McLeod presented three amendments to the City's sign ordinance. He noted the first amendment was to address a recent Zoning Board of Appeals case,

and explained that the amendment would allow businesses with approved site plans and uses, but without a Certificate of Occupancy (CO), to erect monument signs, ensuring equal signage rights for all businesses. He stated the second amendment would permit illuminated signage for second-floor non-residential uses in FB and Brooklands Districts, recognizing the need for these businesses to effectively advertise, especially during shorter winter daylight hours. He shared that the third amendment would allow for decorative temporary signage on construction fence screening within the Brooklands district; specifically for The Gerald Development. He highlighted that permitting this would enhance the streetscape during construction by allowing the developer to display project information and local history, differentiating it from standard construction fencing used elsewhere in the city.

Ms. Mungoli expressed support for the decorative fence signage at the Gerald Development, but raised concerns about the illuminated second-floor signage amendment, particularly in the Brooklands area. She shared her concern that allowing such signage could negatively impact residents of second or third-floor condos in buildings facing commercial tenants across the street. She requested clarification on whether there were provisions or "carve-outs" to prevent residents from having illuminated business signs directly facing their living spaces, especially considering the potential for three-story buildings in the area. She stressed her desire to ensure that residential condo owners would not be unduly impacted by commercial signage.

Ms. Roediger acknowledged Ms. Mungoli's concern about potential conflicts between commercial signage and residential units in the Brooklands District and noted that while the likelihood of such a scenario was small due to the size of the parcels and buildings in the Brooklands, it was still possible. She explained that the illuminated signage amendment was primarily intended for larger commercial areas, like those along Rochester Road, where second-story businesses would benefit from increased visibility, especially during winter months.

Ms. Roediger suggested they could carve out an exception for the Brooklands District if the Council desired, or more specifically, to restrict illuminated signage only when a residential building faces a commercial building across a major thoroughfare. She emphasized that the intent was to protect residential condo owners from intrusive signage, without unnecessarily restricting commercial signage in the Brooklands altogether.

Ms. Mungoli moved the motion in the packet with the exception in the Brookland's District where the parcel facing is residential.

Ms. Morlan questioned if this should be limited to the Brooklands District. She referenced a development at the northeast corner of Livernois and Auburn Road noting there are businesses on the first floor and although she was not certain what was going on the second floor, there is residential around it.

Ms. Roediger suggested stating that it shall not face a residential use and to remove the reference to the Brookland's District. She stated this way it would apply in any district.

Ms. Mungoli agreed to the friendly amendment.

Ms. Morlan inquired whether the banner/fence signage would be allowed by other developers throughout the city.

Ms. Roediger stated the thought was to start in the Brooklands District and if it went well, there it could later be expanded to other districts in the city.

Discussion ensued relative to allowing banner/fencing signage throughout the City. Council members Blair and Walker stressed that the content on the signage should be approved by City Staff.

Ms. Roediger noted the challenge with sign ordinances is too much restriction on Freedom of Speech.

Ms. Neubauer stated her concern with the potential of infringing on rights when it comes to regulating speech and content. She continued that she was hesitant to create a city-wide ordinance that starts off broad and becomes restrictive.

President Deel requested the City Attorney weigh in regarding any potential First Amendment implications of a restriction on this type of signage that is subject to staff approval.

City Attorney Dan Christ responded that there is an issue with respect to not providing a standard with respect to how staff would apply the proposal that it would be subject to review by staff. He noted that the language of the text does currently indicate that signage be promoting the approved development for the subject site and stated that it does provide a framework and context in the proposed amendment. He continued that the question would be whether it really requires the additional staff review because it is limited to the approved plans and the approved development for the site.

Ms. Neubauer stated her concern is that without specific standards for the temporary construction fence signage, the City could be opening itself up to subjective interpretations. She reiterated the need for clear guidelines in order to avoid potential disputes and accusations of discrimination.

City Attorney Dan Christ explained that the City would only be able to have a compelling interest if it wishes to change the manner in which the applicant is proposing to convey their message on promotion. He stated that could take a lot of different forms, some of which Council may not be supportive of.

Ms. Morlan questioned whether the City's current signage ordinances would address this.

Ms. Roediger confirmed that the City currently has general regulations for signage. She stated that this fence signage would probably include a developer's name, phone number and "now leasing" verbiage. She questioned whether Ms. Neubauer was in favor of this ordinance being adopted for the Brooklands District.

Ms. Neubauer proposed the development of a specific citywide ordinance for this type of temporary signage, or limiting the current proposal to the Brooklands District as previously discussed.

Mayor Barnett acknowledged the thoughtful discussion and noted that it seems there are two different viewpoints. He requested that Council provide some direction on which approach they preferred so staff can refine the ordinance for the second reading based on that guidance.

A motion was made by Blair, seconded by Morlan, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution with the amendment to allow signage on temporary construction fencing citywide. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 4 - Blair, Carlock, Morlan and Mungoli

Nay 3 - Deel, Neubauer and Walker

Enactment No: RES0191-2024

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby approves the Amendment to Section 134-9 of Article III of Chapter 134 - Signs, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, to allow temporary signage on construction fence screening citywide.

2024-0291 Request for Acceptance for First Reading - An Ordinance to Amend Sections 134-5, 134-6, and 134-9 of Article III of Chapter 134 - Signs, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, to allow signage on properties with approved plans, to allow illuminated signage on second floors when facing a major thoroughfare, to allow temporary signage on construction fence screening and to ensure consistency across various ordinances sections; to repeal conflicting or inconsistent ordinances, and prescribe a penalty for violations

Attachments: [062424 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Ordinance \(Revised\).pdf](#)
[061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Ordinance.pdf](#)
[061024 Resolution.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

See Legislative File 2024-0291 above for Council Discussion.

A motion was made by Mungoli, seconded by Blair, that this matter be Accepted for First Reading by Resolution to include allowing illuminated signage on second floors when facing a major thoroughfare, except when facing a residential use. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 5 - Blair, Carlock, Deel, Morlan and Mungoli

Nay 2 - Neubauer and Walker

Enactment No: RES0191-2024

Resolved, that an Ordinance to Amend Sections 134-5, 134-6, and 134-9 of Article III of Chapter 134 - Signs, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, to allow signage on properties with approved plans, to allow illuminated signage on second floors when facing a major thoroughfare, except where the parcel is facing a residential use, to allow temporary signage on construction fence screening and to ensure consistency across various ordinances sections; to repeal conflicting or inconsistent ordinances, and prescribe a penalty for violations is hereby Accepted for First Reading.

ORDINANCE FOR ADOPTION

2024-0255 Request for Acceptance of Second Reading and Adoption - An Ordinance to Amend Sections 54.741, 54.743, 54.744, and 54.745 of Article XII, Utilities, of Chapter 54, Fees, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, to modify water and sanitary sewer rates and fees, repeal conflicting Ordinances, and prescribe a penalty for violations

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Ordinance.pdf](#)
[050124 WSAC Resolution.pdf](#)
[052024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[052024 Resolution.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

Joe Snyder, Chief Financial Officer, stated this is the second and final reading is to amend the City of Rochester Hills' water and sewer rate fee ordinance to become effective on July 1st, 2024.

He shared that on May 1, 2024, the Water System Advisory Council met to review the water and sewer operating division's year-end financial operating results and trends and to consider, discuss and recommend to city council updated water and sewer rates for the upcoming 2024 to 2025 rate year. He noted that the Water System Advisory Council unanimously recommended the following rate structure which includes the water rate per unit increase of 32 cents per unit, or a 4.7 percent increase, and the sewer rate per unit increase of 31 cents per unit, or 4.81 percent increase, and a customer charge per bill increase of 20 cents per bill, or a 3.4 percent increase. He explained that the only other changes proposed for the updates for the upcoming rate year are various pass-through charges from the Great Lakes Water Authority to industrial and commercial consumers, which average 2.2 percent increase for industrial waste surcharges and a 9.3 percent increase for pollutant surcharges.

Mr. Snyder shared that for a typical residential customer using 12 units per billing cycle, the bi-monthly bill would increase from approximately \$162 to \$170, representing a 4.7 percent increase.

A motion was made by Blair, seconded by Morlan, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Blair, Carlock, Deel, Morlan, Mungioli, Neubauer and Walker

Enactment No: RES0174-2024

Resolved, that an Ordinance to Amend Sections 54.741, 54.743, 54.744, and 54.745 of Article XII, Utilities, of Chapter 54, Fees, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Rochester Hills, Oakland County, Michigan, to modify water and sanitary sewer rates and fees, repeal conflicting Ordinances, and prescribe a penalty for violations is hereby Accepted for Second Reading and Adoption, and shall become effective on Monday, July 1, 2024 following its publication in the Oakland Press on June 16, 2024.

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

2024-0272 Request for Conditional Use Approval to allow for a state licensed residential facility (7-12 residents) at Barns Senior Living, a senior living facility located at 1841 Crooks Rd., between Avon and Hamlin, zoned R-1 One Family Residential; Lijo Anthony, Grace Properties Group, LLC, Applicant

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Email Applicant 053024.pdf](#)
[Staff Report 052124.pdf](#)
[Letter Applicant 050924.pdf](#)
[Survey.pdf](#)
[Development Application.pdf](#)
[Environmental Impact Statement.pdf](#)
[Public Comment \(1 of 2\).pdf](#)
[Public Comment \(2 of 2\).pdf](#)
[Minutes PC 052124 \(Draft\).pdf](#)
[Minutes PC 042021.pdf](#)
[Public Hearing Notice.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

Chris McLeod, Planning Manager, **Mr. Lijo Antony**, Grace Properties Group, LLC, and **Anthony Barracco**, Anwill Construction, were present.

Mr. McLeod stated the applicant is requesting a conditional use permit to increase the capacity of an existing state-licensed residential facility at 1841 Crooks from one to six residents to seven to twelve residents. He noted that currently, the facility operates as a single-family residence, which is permissible under state law; however, exceeding six residents requires City approval. He noted that the request pertains only to 1841 Crooks, not the adjacent facility at 1823 Crooks. He shared that the Planning Commission has recommended approval, noting that the building was originally designed to accommodate more residents. He explained that the existing structure will remain unchanged, with no proposed exterior modifications. He continued that staffing levels will increase, and trash disposal will continue as residential service. He clarified that there are no dumpsters and noted that medical waste is handled appropriately with a service that comes in and takes care of the medical trash. He stated that the facility features eight potential bedrooms, some of which may be shared, and common living spaces.

He addressed the historic barn that sits between both of these buildings and pointed out that it was the subject of a Historic District Commission (HDC) review about three or four years ago and was required to be preserved as part of a historic structure within the City itself. He noted that the preservation of the barn needs to occur whether or not the Council approves the conditional use. He further explained that according to the City's ordinance, the owner of the property cannot allow a

structure to get to a point where it has to be demolished. He shared that the applicant intends to restore the adjacent historic barn for use as a sitting room/library, with a \$300,000 capital improvement plan and a requirement to make the barn weather-tight within two years. He clarified that the City Council must determine if the proposed use meets the City's conditional use standards.

Public Comment:

Mr. Mike Pelzer, 1845 Ludgate Lane, stated his home backs up to the property and that he does not feel that it blends into the community. He raised concern over traffic safety due to delivery trucks which frequently obstruct the roadway to the entrance of the property. He addressed the trash concern pointing out that there have been an excessive number of overflowing trash cans left out on collection days. He also stressed the fact that the applicant's previous promise to make the barn watertight during the prior construction phase was not fulfilled, which raises doubts about their reliability. He stressed that three of the five conditional use criteria are not being met and suggested that these issues be addressed prior to Council approving the Conditional Use.

Ms. Laurel Freer, 1501 Christian Hills Drive, stated her main concern is that she lives in a residential district and this seems more like a business operating in her subdivision. She also expressed concern over potential signage.

Mr. Joe Douglas, 2131 Bretton Drive South, stated the applicant failed to uphold previous commitments regarding maintaining the fence and installing evergreen landscaping intended to shield neighboring properties from the facility's lights and view. He also pointed out that barn restoration never took place and that the landscaping on the property was unfinished, resulting in water runoff and damage to neighboring yards. He stressed precedent will be set if the Council approves this request.

Ms. Barbara Ramirez, 904 Keith Avenue, Oxford, referenced Ms. Freer's comments and pointed out that her mother-in-law tried placing her husband in this home stressing that there is a need for these businesses. She suggested that some residents who support the facility may be hesitant to speak publicly due to community tension. She pointed out that increasing the capacity from six to twelve residents would allow them to better serve families, particularly couples or siblings who wish to live together. She highlighted the spacious rooms and the communal atmosphere of the backyard, emphasizing its use as a gathering space for residents and their families. She urged Council to approve this request.

Ms. Jennifer Hiller, 15567 Imlay City Road, Capac, shared that she is pursuing a career in this field and as such, has driven by this property many times and has watched it develop. She encouraged Council to approve this request stressing what used to be an eyesore is now a beautiful property. She addressed the concerns about traffic and delivery trucks stating it is the same in every community. She stressed the importance of allowing seniors to age within their communities.

Ms. Christine Reschke, 37537 Millstone Trail, Lenox, stated this is the home where her father lives. She encouraged Council to approve the request so her father's twin brother could also live there. She emphasized the quality of care offered at this establishment. She encouraged anyone with concerns relative to delivery trucks, to contact the company directly stating that is what she does if she has a concern with a particular driver.

Council Discussion:

President Deel mentioned that he altered his driving route to observe the traffic patterns around the facility at different times of day and found no significant traffic changes. He expressed concern about the historic barn on the property and questioned what has been done to meet the previous condition of making the barn watertight.

Mr. Antony responded that he has been in contact with several companies regarding the barn's restoration. He committed to making the barn weather-tight within two years, specifically addressing the roof, siding, and windows to prevent water and bird intrusion. He clarified that while his email indicated a completion date before July 2026, he anticipates finishing sooner. He explained that the roof's sagging requires internal support work, making the project a step-by-step process involving ongoing discussions with contractors.

President Deel inquired whether Mr. Anthony has entered into any contracts or if he has architectural plans. He further questioned if he has received any bids on the project.

Mr. Antony responded that he has received bids for the project. He stated that he intends to manage the costs effectively and believes a metal roof would be a long-term solution. He acknowledged that this would require approval from the Historic District Commission (HDC). He emphasized that his first step will be to address the roof and windows, aiming to preserve the exterior while improving its condition.

President Deel expressed that his primary concern with the project is the lack of progress made on the restoration of the barn, which was a condition of the previous approval. He acknowledged the complexity of the barn's reconstruction, but highlighted the apparent contradiction of pursuing a new building while neglecting the barn. He emphasized the City's interest in preserving its historical heritage and reiterated that, after two years, it seemed no work had been done on the barn. He stressed the importance of ensuring the applicant fulfills their obligations to the city before granting further approvals, suggesting the need for discussion to secure guarantees.

Ms. Neubauer stated they discussed the trash issue at the Planning Commission meeting and noted that they were told there would only be two or three trash cans put out at a time. She inquired whether there was a change.

Mr. Antony responded that although they have four trash cans, they generally use about two to three per week. He noted that one is actually in reserve and only used if needed. He pointed out that the recycle bin may be confused with the trash

bins, and sometimes staff will place the trash from both properties, 1841 and 1823, on one side of the driveway so the trash company only has to stop at one address.

He clarified that they currently have four trash cans and three recycle bins at the 1841 Crooks property, which is the maximum amount allowed per residential location. He stated that they do not plan to increase that number.

Ms. Neubauer made note of a lighting concern and requested that Mr. Anthony explain how it was resolved.

Mr. Antony explained that timers have been added to the outdoor lights on the front and the back of the property. He noted that visiting hours end at 8:00 p.m., so none of the residents are outside past that time in the winter, and since it stays light out longer in the summer months, it is not a problem.

Ms. Neubauer mentioned there were complaints that the lighting was also coming from inside the house.

Mr. Antony responded that every bedroom has blinds and staff have been instructed to close the blinds in the evening. He also mentioned that the windows in the dining area have been tinted.

Ms. Neubauer expressed her concern that the \$158,000 bond currently in place is not enough to cover the \$350,000 estimated cost of the project, especially given that costs will likely increase over the next five years. She mentioned the developer has not made progress on a previous five-year plan, leading to a breach of trust. She shared that the Planning Commission has now set deadlines for the barn restoration: water sealing in two years and full restoration in five years. She suggested requiring a larger bond or escrow to ensure these deadlines are met and noted this would allow the City to complete the work themselves if the developer fails, avoiding the need to shut down the facility and displace elderly residents. She questioned whether the \$158,000 bond includes landscaping, and reiterated that she would like to have a bond set in the amount for the full restoration.

Mr. Antony responded that the landscaping has been completed, and mentioned that he would like to get a few more quotes to do the work on the barn.

Ms. Neubauer stated she was willing to approve the project with the condition that the developer must provide detailed construction quotes, essentially contracts, that the City staff and bonding company can use to determine the full restoration cost. She pointed out that this will ensure the bond covers the entire project's expenses, allowing the city to complete it if necessary. She stressed that she wants a straightforward process, avoiding the complexities of special assessments. She reiterated her support for the development itself, acknowledging the need for such facilities.

Mr. Antony stated that from the beginning, it has been his intention to renovate the barn, he just wants to get a few more quotes from contractors and a timeline.

He reiterated that they agreed upon a two-year timeline to make the exterior watertight and questioned what happens if they do not approve the conditional use.

Ms. Neubauer commented that she understands the additional six residents will generate the income to restore the barn. She explained that she wants to ensure the bond amount will cover the work that needs to be done if the applicant does not finish the work.

Ms. Neubauer made the motion to approve the conditional use with an additional condition that a bond be put in the full restorative amount that it would take for the barn to be restored within the next five-year period.

Ms. Mungoli expressed concern that the Planning Commission was too lenient in stipulating what the bond should be. She shared her personal experience with her aging mother-in-law and emphasized the importance of quality elder care facilities. She also pointed out the need for consistency in preserving historical elements in the city. She stressed the importance of the barn and shared that she believes it should be restored to the Historic District Commission (HDC) standards within two years, not five, in order to prevent further deterioration. She continued that the bond should be in the amount that will cover the true cost of materials.

Mr. Carlock noted this item should be separated into two separate concerns. He stated the first is the historic preservation of the barn, and the second is the approval of the senior facility. He questioned who is responsible for enforcing the City's ordinance regarding the barn's potential neglect and shared that there is a financial incentive for the applicant to repair the barn before the City needs to step in.

Vice President Walker referenced the staff report and confirmed there are four staff members providing care currently and it is anticipated to increase to seven for the additional residents should the conditional use be approved. He questioned how many employees will be at the site at any given time.

Mr. Antony responded that there will be a total of seven employees to care for the 12 residents; however there will only be two staff on site at any given time. He noted that they do have an overlapping shift where there are three staff present during the busy times from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. and from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m.

Vice President Walker requested that the applicant clarify the staff living arrangements.

Mr. Antony explained that they have a combination, at some of his other properties they have some staff that will stay on property and they work as a live-in staff. He stated they also have a staff member that stays onsite for three straight days in order to save on transportation. He noted that they have a room that is designated for staff as a break room or for them to rest.

Vice President Walker concurred that the conditional use application for the

group home is a separate issue from the barn restoration, though they are related due to their location. He reviewed the criteria associated with approval of a conditional use and expressed concern that the application may not meet all the required criteria, particularly regarding compatibility and harmonious operation within the residential neighborhood. He noted that resident complaints about light, trash, and traffic raise questions about whether the facility's operation is truly harmonious, and the scale of a 12-resident facility with seven caregivers is viewed as potentially commercial, which may not be appropriate for a residential zone.

Mr. Antony addressed the concerns about the proposed expansion of the group home, emphasizing that the changes would not significantly impact the surrounding neighborhood. He stated no additional lighting or building modifications were planned, and the residents, who require substantial care, do not leave the home and therefore, would not generate increased traffic. He continued that medical visits, hospice care, and deliveries would be consolidated, minimizing external traffic. He stressed that trash and recycling would remain within existing limits and that the increased resident capacity, while seemingly commercial, remained within residential zoning guidelines. He explained that they are looking into a resident trash compactor that can be installed in the garage that can process four bags of trash into one indicating that it is new technology. He acknowledged that more residents might occasionally use the patio during warmer months, but overall, the daily operations and external impact would remain largely unchanged.

Mr. Blair thanked Mr. Antony for building in the City, commenting that it is a beautiful building and it serves a need in our community for senior housing. He questioned whether the cost to the residents living in the home will decrease if he is granted the conditional use or increase if he does not receive it due to the overhead he is unable to capitalize on.

Mr. Antony responded the only decrease would be for the spouse sharing the same room, there is a second person discount.

Mr. Blair confirmed that the price will not change depending on whether or not the conditional use is approved. He reiterated concerns previously expressed by neighbors, as well as the neglect of the historic barn and requested the applicant respond to those concerns.

Mr. Antony referenced the comment made about the fence on the property and explained that the City required the fence be removed. He shared that the concerns expressed about runoff pertain to the other property, 1823 Crooks, which was also inspected by Code Enforcement and found to be done according to City regulations. He noted that any runoff associated with the 1841 property has been mitigated by the placement of sod.

Ms. Neubauer requested the applicant explain the lighting utilized on the house in order to clarify any confusion.

Mr. Barracco explained that the lighting on the property is standard residential lighting, consisting of a few can lights on the back porch and approximately a

dozen more around the front of the house with LED lights. He emphasized that the brightness is comparable to any other residential property in the neighborhood, noting that while the white house with black windows might make the lights appear more pronounced, it is not inherently brighter. He acknowledged that lights are more noticeable at night, particularly during winter evenings, but argued this is typical of all homes. He reiterated that timers have been installed to automatically turn off the lights at a set time.

Ms. Neubauer questioned if it would be easier to enforce, and more difficult for the applicant to litigate, a condition agreed upon rather than enforcing an ordinance.

City Attorney Christ responded that it would provide an additional argument for the City to bring against the applicant.

Ms. Neubauer concluded that agreeing to a bond and having that set at the proper amount is advantageous for the City.

Mr. Antony stated that all he wants is to get a few more quotes from different people and that Mr. Barracco has agreed to look at renovating the barn himself. He mentioned he is happy to set up a bond.

Ms. Neubauer restated the motion she made is to include a bond in the full amount of the renovation and the timetable that it be completed in. She clarified that the bond amount be set and approved subject to city staff approval.

Mr. Antony explained that before they would issue a Certificate of Occupancy, the city's Building Department required that the gas and electrical to the barn be removed because it was not done to code. He noted that they will restore it if the city's permitting process will allow it.

Ms. Morlan shared that she, her husband and her son travel Crooks at multiple different times daily and none of them have experienced an issue with traffic in front of this location. She questioned if the applicant would consider changing the timer to have the lights go off at 8:00 p.m. and noted that Council received some photos of some water run-off from the recent storms and inquired if something could be done to take care of that.

Mr. Antony stated he was agreeable to having the lights go off at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Barracco responded that the whole backyard has been seeded, and additional seed and straw will be going down tomorrow. He indicated that water run-off issue should be completely taken care of within one month.

Ms. Morlan inquired whether the applicant would be willing to reach out to the neighbor at 2131 Bretton who experienced damage to his yard due to the water run-off to ensure it has been taken care of and that this issue has been resolved.

Mr. Barracco agreed to reach out to the neighbor.

Ms. Morlan questioned that if by the applicant building the second home larger than the needed capacity at the time, it took the funding that could have been utilized for the renovation of the barn.

Mr. Antony responded that was not the case and explained that the entire project was quoted in 2019, pre-COVID and was fully funded. He shared that after COVID hit, the property at 1841 ended up costing much more than anticipated to develop. He concluded that the barn was a separate project.

Ms. Morlan questioned if there would be a benefit to postponing this until the applicant received the quotes and was able to provide actual numbers before Council took a vote on this.

Mr. Antony commented they have some waiting lists for individuals wanting to move into their buildings and stated he would like to expedite this if possible.

Ms. Morlan inquired what the next step would be for the applicant to obtain his licensing.

Mr. Antony responded that his application has already been submitted to the State. He explained that once he receives the conditional use permit, he needs to forward that to the State and the rest is regular standard process. He clarified, however, that once the conditional use permit has been supplied to the State, they will be allowed to operate at the higher capacity.

Mayor Barnett stated that this has been uniquely challenging in terms of a development process. He pledged to be the ombudsman to ensure that the City plays an appropriate role in trying to make this as close to harmonious as a development can be. He commented that the administration's preference would be to get the bond up front to ensure that the money was available for the restoration of the barn.

President Deel stated this request promotes the intent and purpose of the ordinance, that it is designed to be maintained as to be harmonious. He commented that these structures are, at heart, residential in nature. He commented that many of the issues that have been raised tonight by the residents are issues that are often heard with many other residential developments. He noted the motion made adequately sets the amount of the bond to the full restorative value, which would ultimately be determined by the City and can also be adjusted by staff as necessary.

Mr. Blair raised whether Council should pursue the option previously brought up to postpone this item stating that it would give Council time to review the proposals, and to see that the issues with the other residents have been resolved.

Ms. Neubauer expressed concern with postponing this item due to the fact that the developer stated he is willing to post the bond at the full amount, and he may not be willing to do that in July. She also noted that a lot of the resident's concerns have already been addressed. For those reasons, and based on the Mayor's statement that the City will enforce what they need to if a detrimental situation

arises with any of the neighbors, she stated it would be beneficial not to postpone this item.

Mr. Blair stated based on that explanation, he was in agreement with not postponing the item.

President Deel stated Councilman Carlock had a previous engagement and requested permission to leave. He noted that his absence at this point in the proceedings is excused.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Mungioli, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 7 - Blair, Carlock, Deel, Morlan, Mungioli, Neubauer and Walker

Enactment No: RES0175-2024

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby approves the Conditional Use to allow a State Licensed Residential Facility for 7-12 residents, based on documents received by the Planning Department on April 15, 2024 along with those comments and representations made as a part of the public hearing, with the following findings:

Findings

1. The proposed use will promote the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance.
2. The existing building and proposed conditional use have been designed and is proposed to be operated, maintained, and managed so as to be compatible, harmonious, and appropriate in appearance with the existing and planned character of the general vicinity, adjacent uses of land, and the capacity of public services and facilities affected by the use.
3. The existing development and proposed use are served adequately by essential public facilities and services, such as a major roadway, police and fire protection, water and sewer, drainage ways, and refuse disposal.
4. The existing development and proposed use should not be detrimental, hazardous, or disturbing to existing or future neighboring land uses, persons, property, or the public welfare as the facility already operates as a State Licensed Residential Facility for 1-6 persons and already has staffing onsite and as stated there no physical improvements/modifications planned to either the interior or exterior of the existing structure or site.
5. The proposal will not create additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services that will be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.

Conditions

1. The Barns shall be registered with or licensed by the State of Michigan for no more than 12 persons, and shall comply with applicable standards for such facilities. Further, the applicant must provide the Planning department with documentation of the license within thirty (30) days, once it is approved by the State.
2. The applicant shall provide a financial surety, in the full restorative amount for the renovation of the barn to be completed to the standards of the Historic Districts

Commission (HDC), as adjusted by Staff as necessary, within thirty days of the conditional use approval to ensure the barn restoration as discussed at the Planning Commission. The Applicant is required within two years of City Council approval to make the barn structure watertight, and within five years of City Council approval to complete the final barn renovations, as outlined in the applicant's submittal and pursuant to all necessary City approvals.

3. The applicant must finalize all permits and inspections relative to the water service/fire hydrant installed as a part of the original structure construction.

4. If Staff determines that trash is not being adequately managed, the Applicant shall work with Staff to remedy the issue to eliminate any nuisance to the general public or abutting neighbors.

5. The applicant must reduce the light that emanates from the property and negatively affects neighbors by keeping window shades pulled, by adding plantings, or by other acceptable means as approved by Staff.

6. That the site be in compliance with all building and code requirements.

(Mr. Carlock exited at 9:28 p.m.)

ROLL CALL

Present 6 - David Blair, Ryan Deel, Carol Morlan, Theresa Mungoli, Marvie Neubauer and David Walker

Absent 1 - Jason Carlock

PUBLIC COMMENT for Items not on the Agenda

Mr. Jerry Weast, 201 Sandalwood Drive, expressed concern over the damage done to his lawn during the installation of fiber optics in his neighborhood. He stated heavy machinery and large pipes were used in the process that destroyed sections of his yard. He provided photos of the damage and requested the City inspect the lawns in his neighborhood and provide assistance to ensure the lawns are restored.

CONSENT AGENDA

All matters under Consent Agenda are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion, without discussion. If any Council Member or Citizen requests discussion of an item, it will be removed from Consent Agenda for separate discussion.

2024-0286 Approval of Minutes - City Council Special Meeting - March 18, 2024

Attachments: [CC Special Min 031824.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0176-2024

Resolved, that the Minutes of the Rochester Hills City Council Special Meeting held on March 18, 2024 be approved as presented.

2024-0285 Approval of Minutes - City Council Regular Meeting - March 18, 2024

Attachments: [CC Min 031824.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0177-2024

Resolved, that the Minutes of the Rochester Hills City Council Regular Meeting held on March 18, 2024 be approved as presented/amended.

2024-0287 Approval of Minutes - City Council Regular Meeting - April 8, 2024

Attachments: [CC Min 040824.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0178-2024

Resolved, that the Minutes of the Rochester Hills City Council Regular Meeting held on April 8, 2024 be approved as presented/amended.

2024-0296 Approval of Minutes - City Council Regular Meeting - April 22, 2024

Attachments: [CC Min 042224.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0179-2024

Resolved, that the Minutes of the Rochester Hills City Council Regular Meeting held on April 22, 2024 be approved as presented/amended.

2024-0290 Request for Approval of a Fireworks Display Permit for the Festival of the Hills event to be held at Borden Park on June 26, 2024

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Application.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0180-2024

Whereas, American Fireworks of Hudson, Ohio, has been selected through a competitive

bid process for their safety record and the size of our show;

Whereas, American Fireworks has provided the necessary insurance with the City of Rochester Hills named as also insured;

Whereas, the Rochester Hills Fire Department has no objection to the issuance of a fireworks permit provided their safety procedures are followed;

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council does hereby approve a permit for American Fireworks of Hudson, Ohio, to provide a fireworks display for the Festival of the Hills event at Borden Park on Wednesday, June 26, 2024.

- 2024-0270** Request for Purchase Authorization - PARKS: Blanket Purchase Order/Contract for construction engineering services related to the replacement design and permitting for the Museum Pedestrian Bridge and Boardwalk Replacements in the amount not-to-exceed \$53,200.00; Hubbell, Roth & Clark, Bloomfield Hills, MI

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Proposal for Services.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0181-2024

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby authorizes a Blanket Purchase Order/Contract for construction engineering services related to the replacement design and permitting for the Museum Pedestrian Bridge and Boardwalk Replacements to Hubbell, Roth and Clark, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan in the amount not-to-exceed \$53,200.00 and further authorizes the Procurement Manager to execute the agreement on behalf of the City.

- 2024-0283** Request for Purchase Authorization - FAC/COMMUNICATIONS: Increase to existing Blanket Purchase Order for telephone maintenance, service, and support services in the amount of \$5,000.00 for a new not-to-exceed amount of \$30,000.00 through August 31, 2024; BSB Communications, Inc., Sterling Heights, MI

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0182-2024

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby authorizes an increase to the existing Blanket Purchase Order for telephone maintenance, service and support services to BSB Communications, Inc., Sterling Heights, Michigan in the amount of \$5,000.00 for a new not-to-exceed amount of \$30,000.00 through August 31, 2024.

- 2024-0292** Request for Purchase Authorization - DPS/ENG: Approval of Standard Agreement for Municipal Street Lighting Agreement between the City of Rochester Hills and the Detroit Edison Company for the installation of one (1) municipal street light at the intersection of E. Hamlin and Somerville Road in the amount of \$1,122.51; DTE Energy, Belleville, MI

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Purchase Agreement.pdf](#)
[Budget Letter.pdf](#)
[GIS Map.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

This Matter was Adopted by Resolution on the Consent Agenda.

Enactment No: RES0183-2024

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby approves the Standard Agreement and provides purchase authorization for the installation of one (1) municipal street light at the intersection of E. Hamlin and Somerville Road in the amount of \$1,122.51 payable to DTE Energy, Belleville, Michigan and further authorizes the Mayor to execute the agreement on behalf of the City.

Passed the Consent Agenda

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Walker, including all the preceding items marked as having been adopted on the Consent Agenda. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Blair, Deel, Morlan, Mungoli, Neubauer and Walker

Absent 1 - Carlock

LEGISLATIVE & ADMINISTRATIVE COMMENTS

President Deel addressed Mr. Jerry Weast, the resident who spoke about concerns with AT&T tearing up his yard under Public Comments. He shared that AT&T performed an infrastructure update, bringing fiber into his neighborhood last year. He noted that going through the process was a bit difficult as they did a lot of boring; however, his HOA worked with AT&T to restore the lawns and replace any broken sprinkler heads. He shared that he was very happy with the final outcome. He noted AT&T was a good partner with his neighborhood and hopes they will be as well for Mr. Weast.

He announced that school is out for the summer and wished everyone a wonderful summer vacation.

Ms. Mungoli thanked the Mayor and his team for responding so quickly to the request for a light at Hamlin and Somerville. She pointed out that the item was on the Consent Agenda and noted that within six weeks after the issue was brought to the City's attention, it had been approved for installation.

Mr. Blair also responded to Mr. Weast acknowledging the temporary inconvenience caused by AT&T's right-of-way project and also emphasized the transformative nature of the fiber optic technology being installed. He encouraged the residents to be patient and stressed that the new service will be worth the temporary inconvenience.

He wished everyone a happy Pride Month and shared a flyer on Pride in the Park to be held at the Rochester Municipal Park on June 22, 2024 from noon to

4:30 p.m.

Mayor Barnett provided the following updates:

He referenced the public comment by Mr. Weast and stated that they have received other comments about the work being done by AT&T. He mentioned Bill Fritz has been working with AT&T and will follow-up with the residents.

He announced that the City officially received a letter from GFL indicating that the City's waste hauling contract has been sold to Priority Waste. He mentioned that he has a meeting scheduled for this Friday with representatives from GFL, and he has also spoken with team members from Priority Waste. He noted Jodi Welch is running point on this, and she has been receiving a daily email or phone call with an update. As soon as he has more information, he will present it to City Council. There are 50 finalists for the Art on Auburn 2 contest. Cast your vote now through June 30th at rochesterhills.org/voteartonauburn2. The winning artists will have their art displayed in the Brooklands Plaza.

After sharing the news that Spencer Park would have to be closed on Memorial Day weekend due to a shortage of lifeguard staff, several news stations ran a story on it. What started as a negative story quickly turned positive: the City received 65 lifeguard applications within 24 hours of the newscast. Spencer Park is now staffed and will be open seven days a week starting this Thursday.

He highlighted a resident who placed 2000 American flags in his front yard as a wonderful tribute to our nation and our fallen heroes.

We have two pieces of art from the DIA Inside Out Program on display on the Clinton River Trail; one is by Veterans Memorial Pointe, and another a little further down the trail.

Both he and Councilmember Carlock beat Auburn Hills and brought home the Mayor's Cup for the first time in 10 years, participating in the Paddle Palooza River Event between Rochester Hills and Auburn Hills.

The Adams Road Corridor community update meeting will take place next Monday, June 17th from 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at West Middle School. Residents are encouraged to attend and give their input on the next steps for Adams Road.

He showed a video highlighting a visit from Ava Katherine Senkarik at the Fire Department one year after she was delivered by Rochester Hills Firefighter/Paramedics Paul Terbrack and Stephen Jelsch in the back of their ambulance on the way to the hospital.

ATTORNEY'S REPORT

City Attorney Dan Christ had nothing to report.

NEW BUSINESS

- 2024-0288** Request for Approval of an Update to the Police-School Liaison Program Intergovernmental Agreement between the Avondale School District and the City of Rochester Hills

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Agreement \(Redlined\).pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

Joe Snyder, Chief Financial Officer, stated this is an update to the Interlocal Agreement which allows for an Oakland County Sheriff's School Resource Officer to be placed in the two Avondale Schools within the City of Rochester Hills. He noted that this position is funded through a State of Michigan grant, and the State has requested an additional sentence be added to the existing interlocal agreement stating that the officer involved in the program shall not be used to enforce school discipline. He stated Captain Yeiser had no objection to this language.

Ms. Morlan commented on the importance of these officers in our schools.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Morlan, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Blair, Deel, Morlan, Mungioli, Neubauer and Walker

Absent 1 - Carlock

Enactment No: RES0184-2024

Resolved, that the City of Rochester Hills City Council hereby approves the update to the Police-School Liaison Program Intergovernmental Agreement between the Avondale School District and the City of Rochester Hills.

Be It Further Resolved, that the Mayor is authorized to execute the updated Intergovernmental Agreement on behalf of the City.

- 2024-0277** Request for Purchase Authorization - FACILITIES: Blanket Purchase Order for snow removal services for the 2024-2025 winter season for City Hall, 52/3rd District Court, Oakland County Sheriff's Office Substation, the fire stations and Brooklands Plaza parking lots in the amount not-to-exceed \$170,000.00 through June 30, 2025; Ultra Professional Outdoor Services, LLC, Waterford,

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

Tim Hollis, Deputy Director Building, stated this request is for a one-year extension of the current contract.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Mungioli, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Blair, Deel, Morlan, Mungioli, Neubauer and Walker

Absent 1 - Carlock

Enactment No: RES0185-2024

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby authorizes a Blanket Purchase Order for snow removal services for the 2024-2025 winter season for City Hall, 52/3rd District Court, Oakland County Sheriff's Office Substation, the fire stations and Brooklands Plaza parking lots to Ultra Professional Outdoor Services, LLC., Waterford, Michigan in the amount not-to-exceed \$170,000.00 through June 30, 2025.

2024-0278 Request for Purchase Authorization - FACILITIES: Contract/Blanket Purchase Order for janitorial services in the amount not-to-exceed \$170,000.00 through June 30, 2025; Americlean, Inc., Chesterfield Township, MI

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

Tim Hollis, Deputy Director, Building, stated this request is for a one-year extension of the current contract.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Morlan, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Blair, Deel, Morlan, Mungioli, Neubauer and Walker

Absent 1 - Carlock

Enactment No: RES0186-2024

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby authorizes a Contract/Blanket Purchase Order for janitorial services to Americlean, Inc., Chesterfield Township, Michigan in the amount not-to-exceed \$170,000.00 through June 30, 2025 and further authorizes the Procurement Manager to execute an agreement on behalf of the City.

2024-0259 Request for Purchase Authorization - DPS/ENG: Increase to the Blanket Purchase Order/Contract for construction engineering services for the Pedestrian Crossing/HAWK Signal at Adams Road and Marketplace Circle in the amount of \$14,100.00 for a new not-to-exceed amount of \$61,000.00; OHM Advisors, Auburn Hills, MI

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Amendment.pdf](#)
[Redesign Sketch.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

Bill Fritz, Public Services Director, stated this request is to increase the construction engineering services. He explained that design modifications were identified by the consultant, and at the request of the Friends of the Clinton River Trail, in order to comply with ADA requirements.

Public Comment:

Mr. Gabe McCoy, 864 Honeycrisp, expressed his support and excitement for the new pedestrian crossing on Adams Road near Leach Road. He stated he works in the Rochester Hills Corporate Center, and most days he chooses to leave his car at home and rides his bicycle to work and community events. He commented that the new crossing will benefit everyone that uses the Clinton River Trail.

Council Discussion:

Ms. Mungoli inquired whether the crosswalk project has been rebid and whether or not they expect to see an increased cost associated with the construction of the crosswalk.

Mr. Fritz responded that it is under contact so it will not be rebid. He noted that to comply with the ADA requirements will require a little more concrete repair, but the cost should be negligible.

Ms. Mungoli questioned the timeline for completing this project.

Mr. Fritz stated it will be done this year.

A motion was made by Mungoli, seconded by Morlan, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Blair, Deel, Morlan, Mungoli, Neubauer and Walker

Absent 1 - Carlock

Enactment No: RES0187-2024

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby authorizes an increase to the Blanket Purchase Order/Contract for construction engineering services for the Pedestrian Crossing/HAWK Signal at Adams Road and Marketplace Circle to OHM Advisors, Auburn Hills, Michigan in the amount of \$14,100.00 for a new not-to-exceed amount of \$61,000.00 and further authorizes the Procurement Manager to execute the agreement on behalf of the City.

2024-0293 Request for Purchase Authorization - DPS/ENG: Cost Participation Agreement approval between the Board of Commissioners (BOARD) for the County of Oakland and the City of Rochester Hills for the Local Road Improvement Matching Fund Pilot Program in the amount of \$260,689.00; County of Oakland, Waterford, MI

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Exhibit A.pdf](#)
[Exhibit B.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

Bill Fritz, Public Services Director, stated this request is for approval to enter into the Local Road Improvement Program with Oakland County.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Morlan, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Blair, Deel, Morlan, Mungoli, Neubauer and Walker

Absent 1 - Carlock

Enactment No: RES0188-2024

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby approves the Cost Participation Agreement between the City of Rochester Hills and the Board of Commissioners (BOARD) for the County of Oakland for the Local Road Improvement Matching Fund Pilot Program in the amount of \$260,689.00 and further authorizes the Mayor to sign the agreement on behalf of the City.

- 2024-0294** Request for Purchase Authorization - DPS/ENG: Purchase authorization of one (1) new Sewer Inspection Camera in the amount of \$29,888.02; Jack Doheny Company, Columbus, OH

Attachments: [061024 Agenda Summary.pdf](#)
[Quote.pdf](#)
[Resolution \(Draft\).pdf](#)

Bill Fritz, Public Services Director stated this request is to replace a camera that was damaged beyond repair. He pointed out that the City will be reimbursed from the Michigan Municipal Risk Management Authority (MMRMA), less any deductible.

A motion was made by Neubauer, seconded by Morlan, that this matter be Adopted by Resolution. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye 6 - Blair, Deel, Morlan, Mungioli, Neubauer and Walker

Absent 1 - Carlock

Enactment No: RES0189-2024

Resolved, that the Rochester Hills City Council hereby authorizes the purchase of one (1) new sewer inspection camera to Jack Doheny Company, Columbus, Ohio in the amount of \$29,888.02.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

NEXT MEETING DATE -City Council Regular Meeting - June 24, 2024 - 7:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before Council, it was moved by Neubauer and seconded by Mungioli to adjourn the meeting at 9:59 p.m.

RYAN DEEL, President
Rochester Hills City Council

LEANNE SCOTT, MMC, Clerk
City of Rochester Hills

Approved as presented at the April 7, 2025 Regular City Council Meeting.